	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/650,369	POTTER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Zachariah Lucas	1648
All Participants:	Status of Applicatio	n:
(1) Zachariah Lucas.	(3)	
(2) Roberta L. Robins.	(4)	•
Date of Interview: 2 November 2004	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	cant's representative)	
D_41		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:  NA		
Claims discussed:	7	· ·
11-13, 15, 16, 29-36, 38-45		
Prior art documents discussed:  NA		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENI See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		•
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. To of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa</li> </ul>	he examiner will provide a record of the substance of	of the interview, since the interview
		,
1 Cm		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applican	nt/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called Applicant to inform them that the claims would be in condition for allowance if claims11-13, 15, 16, and, 38-45 were amended to read on polynucleotides encoding - - multiple epitope fusion polypeptides - - rather than "multiple epitopes fusion polypeptides" (to maintain consistency between the specification and the claims), and if claims 29-36 were amended to read on isolated cells to clarify that the host cells were not part of a human organism. The Applicant agreed to the amendments and indicated that an Examiner's Amendment making the suggested changes would be acceptable.